

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
9 AT SEATTLE

10 JAYAKRISHNAN K NAIR, et al.,

11 Plaintiffs,

12 v.

13 RICHARD SYMMES, et al.,

14 Defendants.  
15

CASE NO. C19-1577 MJP

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR  
RECONSIDERATION

16 THIS MATTER comes before the Court on Plaintiffs' Motion for Reconsideration of  
17 Dismissal. (Dkt. No. 25.) Having reviewed the Motion and all related papers, the Court  
18 DENIES the Motion.

19 Plaintiffs filed this case on October 3, 2019, alleging that the Defendants defrauded  
20 Plaintiffs, thereby causing the collapse of Plaintiffs' real estate business and personal wealth.  
21 (Dkt. No. 1.) On October 30, 2019, the Court ordered the Parties to file a Joint Status Report  
22 ("JSR") no later than December 11, 2019. (Dkt. No. 10.) At the request of Plaintiff, on  
23 December 4, 2019 the Court extended the deadline to file the JSR to January 16, 2020. (Dkt. No.  
24

1 19.) After no JSR was filed, the Court extended the deadline to February 10, 2020. (Dkt. No.  
2 22.) And once again, the Parties missed their deadline. On February 19, 2020, the Court  
3 dismissed the case due to the parties' failure to file a JSR. (Dkt. No. 24.)

4 Motions for reconsideration are disfavored and are ordinarily denied "in the absence of a  
5 showing of manifest error in the prior ruling or a showing of new facts or legal authority which  
6 could not have been brought to its attention earlier with reasonable diligence." See LCR 7(h)(1).  
7 Plaintiffs' motion does not provide the Court with sufficient justification for reconsideration.  
8 Even giving pro se plaintiffs the benefit of any doubt, see Karim-Panahi v. Los Angeles Police  
9 Dept., 839 F.2d 621, 623 (9th Cir. 1988), they failed to comply with the Court's Orders  
10 regarding the JSR although given ample opportunity to do so. (See Dkt. Nos. 10, 19, 22.) The  
11 Court notes further that Plaintiffs' Motion for Reconsideration proposes that they be allowed to  
12 file a JSR on March 20, 2020. (Dkt. No. 25 at 3.) Alternatively, Plaintiffs ask the Court to issue  
13 a new deadline for filing the JSR. (Id.) Because the JSR was originally due on December 11,  
14 2020 (Dkt. No. 10), and the Court has already granted the Parties two extensions (Dkt. Nos. 19,  
15 22), Plaintiffs' proposal is unacceptable.

16 Therefore, the Court DENIES the Motion. The dismissal entered on February 19, 2020  
17 remains in effect.

18  
19 The clerk is ordered to provide copies of this order to Plaintiffs and all counsel.

20 Dated March 9, 2020.

21 

22 Marsha J. Pechman  
23 Senior United States District Judge  
24